

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for the Final Official Action dated June 16, 2006 and Advisory action dated October 20, 2006.. This amendment and request for reconsideration is intended to be fully responsive thereto.

Claim 4 was objected to as being of improper dependent form. Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled, thus rendering this objection moot. Claims 7 and 8 have been objected to because of minor informalities. Claims 7 and 8 have been deleted rendering this objection moot.

Claims 5 and 12-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 5 and 15 have been deleted. Claims 12 and 16 have been amended to overcome the Examiner's rejection. No new matter has been added. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-4 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bergh (US D419,520). The applicant respectfully disagrees. However, in the interest in advancing prosecution, claims 1-4 & 8 have been cancelled in favor of allowable claims 12-14 & 16-17. Claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hougham (USPN 5,310,102). . Claims 1, 3, 4, 5 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smith (US 5,465,889). Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Perkins (US 6,097,448). Here again applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hougham in view of Rassias (US 6,149,042). The applicant respectfully disagrees. Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bergh

Appl. No. 10/673,632
In re Hussaini at al.
Reply to Final Office Action of Jun. 16, 2006

in view of Patterson (US 2001/0039903). However claims 1-11, 15 & 18-19 have been cancelled rendering the rejections moot.

Claims 12-14, 16 and 17 were indicated as allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and to include all the limitation of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, claims 12 & 16 have been rewritten in independent form to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, and to include all the limitations of the base claim and all intervening claims. No new matter has been added no new issues raised.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 12-14 & 16-17 define the invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner believe further discussion regarding the above claim language would expedite prosecution they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted:

By: 

Matthew Johnston
Reg. N° 41,096

Berenato, White & Stavish
Suite 240
6550 Rock Spring Drive
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
(301) 896-0600